IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

KENNETH E. FINK,

Petitioner,

: Civil Action No. v.

THOMAS J. CARROLL, Warden, Delaware Correctional Center and CARL C. DANBERG, Attorney General of the State of Delaware. Respondents.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS **UNDER 28 U.S.C. §2254**

- 1. Name and location of court which entered the judgment of conviction under attack: Superior Court of the State of Delaware (New Castle County), 500 N. King Street, Wilmington, DE 19801.
- 2. **Date of judgment of conviction:** (1) conviction by jury March 8, 2002; (2) sentencing date - May 23, 2002.
- 3. Length of Sentence: Petitioner was sentenced to 98 years in jail, suspended after serving 8 years, for 35 years probation. On March 24, 2004, the Court reduced the jail time from 8 years to 6 years.
- 4. **Nature of offense involved:** (1) 15 counts of Unlawfully Dealing in Child Pornography (11 Del.C. §1109(4); (2) 15 counts of Possession of Child Pornography (11 Del.C. §1111).
 - 5. What was your plea? Not Guilty
 - 6. If you pleaded not guilty, what kind of trial did you have? Jury trial
 - 7. Did you testify at the trial? No
 - 8. Did you appeal from the judgment of conviction? Yes
 - 9. If you did appeal, answer the following:
 - (A) Name of court Supreme Court of Delaware
 - **(b) Result** convictions and sentence were affirmed
 - (c) Date of result and citation March 20, 2003; Fink v. State, 817 A.2d 781 (Del.

2003)

(D) Grounds raised:

(1) Whether the search warrant which authorized a search of the defendant's residence violated the 4th Amendment to the United States Constitution and whether the evidence seized as a fruit of that warrant and succeeding search warrants should have been suppressed at trial.

- (2) Whether the sentence of 8 years in jail was excessive.
- (3) Whether the defendant's convictions on 30 separate counts amounted to multiple prosecutions for the same offense in violation of the Double Jeopardy Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution.
- (4) Whether the trial court's instruction concerning the elements of the offenses charged was a correct statement of the law.
- (5) Whether the statutes under which the defendant was convicted were "overbroad" in violation of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.
- (e) If you sought further review of the decision on appeal by a higher state court, please answer the following: Not applicable.
- (f) If you filed a petition for certiorari in the United States Supreme Court, please answer the following with respect to each direct appeal: Not applicable.
- 10. Other than a direct appeal from the judgment of conviction and sentence, have you previously filed any petitions, applications or motions with respect to this judgment in any court, state or federal? Yes.
 - 11. If your answer to 10 was "yes," give the following information:
 - (A) (1) Name of Court Delaware Superior Court (New Castle County)
- (2) Nature of proceeding Petition for post-conviction relief under Superior Court Criminal Rule 61.

(3) Grounds raised:

- (1) Whether the Defendant's appellate counsel was "ineffective" under Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668 (1984) in the defendant's direct appeal in failing to appeal the trial court's ruling concerning the validity of the search of the defendant's computers that were located at the defendant's residence and whether, if the above ruling had been appealed, there is a reasonable probability that the outcome of the appeal would have been different.
- (4) Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on your petition, application or motion? No.
- (5) Result The Rule 61 Motion was denied. State v. Fink, decision dated October 28, 2005 (unreported)
 - (b) As to any second petition.... Not applicable
- (c) Did you appeal to the highest state court having jurisdiction the result of action taken on any petition, application or motion? Yes.
 - (d) If you did not appeal..... Not applicable

- (1) Whether the search warrant which authorized a search of the defendant's residence violated the 4th Amendment to the United States Constitution and whether the evidence seized as a fruit of that warrant and succeeding search warrants should have been suppressed at trial.
- (2) Whether the defendant's convictions on 30 separate counts amounted to multiple prosecutions for the same offense in violation of the Double Jeopardy Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution.
- (3) Whether the statutes under which the defendant was convicted were "overbroad" in violation of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.
- (4) Whether the Defendant's appellate counsel was "ineffective" under *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668 (1984) in the defendant's direct appeal in failing to appeal the trial court's ruling concerning the validity of the search of the defendant's computers that were located at the defendant's residence and whether, if the above ruling had been appealed, there is a reasonable probability that the outcome of the appeal would have been different.
- 13. If any of the grounds listed in 12 were not previously presented in any court, state or federal, state briefly what grounds were not so presented and give your reasons for not presenting them. Not applicable.
- 14. Do you have any petition or appeal now pending in any court, either state or federal, as to the judgment now under attack? No.
- 15. Give the names and addresses of each attorney who represented you at each stage of the judgment attacked herein:
- (1) the following attorneys represented the petitioner during all or part of the period from the time of his arrest through conviction and sentence in the trial court.

Joe A. Hurley, Esquire 1215 King Street Wilmington, DE 19801

Edmund D. Lyons, Jr., Esquire 1526 Gilpin Avenue Wilmington, DE 19806

(2) The following attorneys represented petitioner on direct appeal

Joe A. Hurley, Esquire 1215 King Street Wilmington, DE 19801

(3) The following attorneys represented the petitioner in state court post-conviction proceedings and on appeal in post-conviction proceedings

Joseph M. Bernstein, Esquire 800 N. King Street - Suite 302 Wilmington, DE 19801

- 16. Were you sentenced on more than one count of an indictment, or on more than one indictment, in the same court and at the same time? No.
- 17. Do you have any future sentence to serve after you complete the sentence imposed by the judgment under attack? No.

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays that the Court grant petitioner all relief to which he may be entitled under this Petition

s/ Joseph M. Bernstein
JOSEPH M. BERNSTEIN (#780)
800 N. King Street - Suite 302
Wilmington, DE 19801
302-656-9850
Attorney for Petitioner

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: 3/16/06 s/ Kenneth E. Fink
Kenneth E. Fink

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The US-44 timl core mass in 1:06-CV-00181-GMS. The DOCUMENT 1-2-g and Filed 033/16/2006part alreaded by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the overall state in September 1974, is required for the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docker leaves the Element State instructions on the Reviews of the Formal I

Ment ISEE INSTRUCTIONS O	N THE REVENSE OF THE F	DRM I				
I (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS			
(b) country of Residence of FIRST Listed Plaintiff [EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			THOMAS J. CARROLL, Warden, Delaware Correctional Center, and CARL C. DANBERG, Attorney General of the State of Delaware COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED DEFENDANT (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED			
(C) ATTORNEYS (FIRM NA	WE, ADDRESS, AND TELL	EPHONE NUMBER	ATTORNEYS (IF KNOW	ATTORNEYS (IF KNOWN)		
Joseph M. Bernstein 800 N. King Street - Suite 302 Wilmington, DE 19801 302-656-9850			Loren C. Meyers Department of Justics 820 N. French St. Wilmington, de 19801			
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION PLEEM - NOTE FOR ONLY			III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES PLACE MIX IN ONE BOX			
☐ 1 U.S. Government PlaintH ☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendent	Phalmitti (U.S. Government Not a Party) 2 U.S. Government		For Diversity Cases Only FOR PLANTIFF WILD DESCRIPTION			
28 U.S.C. V. NATURE OF SU	§2254		Habcas Corpus			
CONTINUE		MI	POWELTURE /PENALTY	LANDIUPTEY	OTHER STATUTES	
L 110 Insurance L 120 Mariana L 130 Mariana L 130 Mariana L 130 Mariana L 150 Recovery of Overpayment A Enforcement of Audigment L 151 Recovery of Overpayment Official Medicana Act L 152 Recovery of Overpayment of Verland's Benefits L 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Verland's Benefits L 150 Sectionalism Sensits L 150 Owner Contract L 150 Contract Product Liability REAL PROPERTY L 210 Land Condensusion L 220 Prosections L 230 Reve Liability & Ejectivism L 240 Torts to Land L 244 But Product Liability L 250 As Other Real Property	PERSONAL MACRY 310 Asserve 315 Asperve Product Linking 320 Asserve 320 Asperve Product Linking 320 Asperve Product Linking 330 Asperve 340 Asperve Linking 441 Macry 441 Macry 442 Employment 443 Macry 444 Macry 446 Other Ove Rights	PERSONAL MUNIT 382 Personal Psyly— Mad Majoration 385 Personal Psyly— Mad Majoration 385 Personal Psyly— Personal Psyly— Product Labelly PERSONAL PROPERTY 3771 Other Frame 3771 Other Frame 3771 Other Frame Property Demage Property Demage Property Demage Property Demage Property Demage Property Demage Property Labelly PROJUGER PETSTONS 510 Majoric in Visions Systems retries Corpus 2010 General 510 Majoric in Visions Systems retries Corpus 2010 General 510 Majoric in Visions Systems Facility Corpus 2010 General 510 Majoric in Visions Systems Facility Corpus 2010 General 510 Majoric in Visions Systems Facility Corpus 2010 General 510 Majoric in Visions Systems Facility Corpus 2010 General 2010 General	Triple Agriculture 628 Other Feed & Orig 628 Drug Research Secure 2' Fregory 2's USC 86" 630 Liquid Ulied 640 R R 8 Nack 650 Active Regil 650 Active Regil 650 Active Regil 650 Onceptioner 1,486k 710 For Liber Stinderds Act 720 Liber Name 730 Liber Name 730 Liber Name 740 Research Act 740 Research Act 740 Research Liber Literator 751 Empt Res Act 751 Empt Res	### Agent ### Ag	□ 400 Table Reapportonment □ 410 Repose □ 430 Berries and Benong □ 450 Commerce/EC Researce □ 450 Commerce/EC Researce □ 450 Requises influenced and Comage Organizations □ 810 Securities Province/Province/Exchange □ 850 Securities Province/Prov	
VI. ORIGIN XX 1 Original C Proceeding	2 Removed from II 3 State Court		N ONE BOX ONLY) Penel Repend 5 Anothe Respend (90%)		Appeal to District 7 Judge from Magistrate Judgment	
VII. REQUESTED I COMPLAINT:	N CHECK IF THIS IS UNDER FR.C.P 23	A CLASS ACTION	DEMAND \$	DEMAND \$ Check YES only if demanded in compleme JURY DEMAND: E YES 1030		
VIII. RELATED CA	SE(S) (See instructions	i).	жде	DOCKET NUMBER_		
March 16,		HE OF ATTORNEY OF A	Econo Janoh M. 13	- 1 -	<u> </u>	